

27. (New) The multi-port receptacle of claim 25, wherein the electrical connector is mounted within the cut-out portion prior to mounting the multi-port receptacle to the motherboard.

Remarks

The present amendment is provided in response to the PTO Action dated October 5, 2004. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 21-24 have been amended and new claims 25-27 have been inserted.

In the PTO Action claims 4, 7, 12 and 24 were objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has amended claims 4, 7, 12 and 24 in order to overcome these informalities.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-21, and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bright et al. patent no. 6,558,191 ("Bright"). The PTO Action indicated that Bright discloses a housing 26 defining at least two ports 12a. However, the housing 26 depicted in Bright provides only a single port 12a. Although there are multiple ports provided, each port has a separate housing. Therefore, Bright does not disclose a single monolithic housing having at least two ports provided by each housing.

Claim 1 of the present invention provides for monolithic housing defining at least two ports. Bright fails to disclose this feature of the present invention. Claim 1 also includes additional elements in combination with the monolithic housing. As Bright fails to disclose each of the elements of claim 1, the rejection under §102(e) is improper. Bright does not disclose each of these elements and therefore does not anticipate the present invention of claim 1. Independent claims 13 and 21 also include a monolithic housing. Therefore these claims and the claims depending therefrom are also not anticipated by Bright.

Appl. No. 10/062,979
Amdt. Dated January 5, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2004

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bright. Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and includes limitations thereof. For the reasons discussed above, Bright does not teach or suggest the elements of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 and claim 4, which includes all of the limitations thereof, are not taught or suggested by Bright.

Therefore applicant's claims are patentable over the cited prior art and Applicant respectfully requests that all claims 1-27 be moved to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

David L. Newman
Seyfarth Shaw LLP
Attorneys for Assignee
55 East Monroe Street
Suite 4200
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5803
312-346-8000

By 